

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner's allowance of claim 10 is respectfully acknowledged.

THE AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Claim 13 has been amended to recite a managing unit which manages the electronic tag information by causing the captured image data and the read electronic tag information to relate to each other in a database. See the disclosure in the specification at, for example, page 5, lines 14-19. Amended claim 13 is thus even more fully supported by the original disclosure, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

In addition, withdrawn claims 14 and 16 have been canceled, without prejudice.

No new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that the amendments be approved and entered.

THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

Claims 1, 3, and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of US 2005/0103840 ("Boles")

and USP 7,333,001 ("Lane et al"). This rejection, however, is respectfully traversed.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Boles does not disclose the structure recited in claim 1 whereby a determining device determines whether or not writing of image data into an electronic tag is permitted based on electronic tag information read by an electronic tag reader. The Examiner has pointed to controller 4A and reader 10 of Lane et al to supply the teachings missing from Boles.

As recognized by the Examiner on pages 6-7 of the Office Action, Lane et al discloses at column 15, lines 40-44 that a "controller 4A may then access the security circuit 4F to authenticate the identity of the reader 10 and to determine if the reader 10 is authorized to request information from, or write information into, or otherwise direct the operation of the RFID tag [4]." Accordingly, it is respectfully pointed out that in Lane et al, the reader 10 is the target of authorization. See also column 16, lines 34-50 of Lane et al. And in Lane et al, information obtained from the reader 10 is used by the RFID tag 4 to determine whether the reader 10 is authorized. Thus, in Lane et al, if the reader 10 is authorized, the reader 10 can read from and/or write onto the RFID tag 4, irrespective of the data of the RFID tag 4.

By contrast, according to the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, the authorization target is the writing of data into the electronic tag. As recited in claim 1, a determining device determines whether or not writing of the image data of the article captured by the image capture device into the electronic tag is permitted based on the electronic tag information read by the electronic tag reader from the electronic tag, and an electronic tag writer writes the image data of the article captured by the image capture device into the electronic tag when the determining device determines that the writing of the image data is permitted.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the reader 10 and RFID tag controller 4A of Lane et al do not correspond to the determining device recited in claim 1.

The structure disclosed by Lane et al allows the identity of the reader 10 to be authenticated by the RFID tag 4, to improve the security and accuracy of the data stored in the tag. The structure recited in claim 1, on the other hand, can prevent image data in the electronic tag from being rewritten without permission. With the structure recited in claim 1, it is possible to capture image data of an article by an image capture device, to read electronic tag information from an electronic tag attached to the article, and to write the image data of the article into the electronic tag only when permission is obtained.

With the structure recited in claim 1, it becomes possible to associate the image data of the captured article with the electronic tag information of the article simply by performing an ordinary capturing operation, and the user can appropriately and strictly manage the image data and the electronic tag information of the article.

It is respectfully submitted that even if the Boles and Lane et al were combinable in the manner suggested by the Examiner, they still would not achieve or render obvious the above-described features and advantageous effects of the claimed present invention as recited in independent claim 1.

For similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that computer readable medium claim 15 also patentably distinguishes over Boles and Lane et al.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 15, claims 3 and 13 depending from claim 1, along with allowed independent claim 10, clearly patentably distinguish over Boles and Lane et al under 35 USC 103.

* * * * *

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims, and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz
Reg. No. 33,902

Holtz, Holtz, Goodman & Chick PC
220 Fifth Avenue - 16th Floor
New York, New York 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
Fax No. (212) 319-5101

DH:iv/dd
encs.